

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 are rejected. Claims 1, 14, 27, 39, 42 and 56-58 are amended herein. Claims 1-68 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Support for the Claim amendments can be found throughout the Specification and Figures including page 27 lines 1-8 and Figure 11.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 39-40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bick, U.S. Patent No. 6,924,789 (hereinafter Bick).

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick does not teach subject matter recited in currently independent Claim 39. For instance, currently independent Claim 39 recites (emphasis added):

An integrated keypad assembly for an electronic device comprising:
a keymat having a plurality of keys formed therein, said keymat deformable to actuate a switch sensor; and
a capacitive sensor that is coupled to and integrated within said keymat.

According to the Federal Circuit, “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each claim under consideration” (W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the current Office Action, the Examiner makes reference to Bick in supporting the grounds of rejection. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Bick teaches a capacitive sensor 19 that is positioned below a keymat 17 (see Figs. 3 and 4; col. 2, lines 51-53). Moreover, at columns 2 lines 35-column 3 lines 29, Bick clearly shows a number of layers disposed below keymat 17 including second optical adhesive layer 27, sensor 19, third optical adhesive layer 28, electroluminescent layer 29, dome adhesive gasket 30 and flexible substrate 31.

Since Bick fails to teach the keymat having a plurality of keys formed therein and a capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 39, but instead teaches a capacitive sensor and a number of other layers below a keymat 17, Applicants respectfully contend that Bick cannot anticipate Claim 39. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Bick is missing an essential element for a *prima facie* anticipation as claimed in Independent Claim 39 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is overcome.

Furthermore, since Claims 40 and 43 depend from Independent Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 40 and 43 derive patentability at least therefrom.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 13-15, 21, 25, 26, 44-46, 55-59, 67 and 68

Claims 1-4, 13-15, 21, 25, 26, 44-46, 55-59, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick in view of Seely et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,188,391 (hereinafter Seely).

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 1 (and similarly Independent Claims 14 and 58). For instance, Independent Claim 1 recites in part:

a keymat having a plurality of keys formed therein, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat;

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 1. For the same reasons that Bick does not teach or render obvious the keymat having a plurality of keys formed therein and a capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat of

Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Bick in combination with Seely et al. does not teach or render obvious the claimed features of Independent Claim 1.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick and Seely et al. are missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness as claimed in Independent Claims 1, 14 and 58 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome.

Also, since Claims 2-4 and 13 depend from Independent Claim 1, Claims 15, 21 and 25-26 depend from Independent Claim 14, Claims 44-46 and 55-57 depend from Independent Claim 39 and Claims 59 and 67-68 depend from Independent Claim 58, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 2-4, 13, 15, 21, 25-26, 44-46, 55-57, 59 and 67-68 derive patentability at least therefrom.

Claims 5-12, 16-20, 22-24, 47-54 and 60-66

Claims 5-12, 16-20, 22-24, 47-54 and 60-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick and Seely and further in view of Kleinhans et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,664,489 (hereinafter Kleinhans).

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick and Seely and further in view of Kleinhans fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Claims 5-12, 16-20, 22-24, 47-54 and 60-66.

Applicants respectfully contend, for the reasons provided herein, that Claims 1, 14, 27, 39 and 58 are allowable.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5-12 depend from Independent Claim 1, Claims 16-20 and 22-24 depend from Independent Claim 14, Claims 47-54 depend from Independent Claim 39 and Claims 60-66 depend from Independent Claim 58, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 5-12, 16-20, 22-24, 47-54 and 60-66 derive patentability at least therefrom.

Claim 41

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick in view of Kleinhans.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Claim 41.

Applicants respectfully contend, for the reasons provided herein, that Bick does not teach or render obvious the features of Claim 39. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Bick does not teach or render obvious the claimed feature of Claim 41 which is dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 39.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick is missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness as claimed in Independent Claim 39 and as such the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 41 is allowable.

Claims 27-38

Claims 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick in view of Seely and Kleinhans.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick and Seely and further in view of Kleinhans fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Claims 5-12, 16-20, 22-24, 47-54 and 60-66.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 recites in part:

said capacitive sensing device is coupled to a keymat having a plurality of keys formed therein, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely and Kleinhans either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the keymat having a plurality of keys formed

therein, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat as recited in Independent Claim 27.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick and Seely and Kleinhans are missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness and as such the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome.

Also, since Claims 28-28 depend from Independent Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 28-38 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of rejected Claims 1-68.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 10/12/07

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 377-0500